

REMARKS

Prior to the present amendment, claims 1-11 were pending in the present application. By the present amendment, claim 12 has been added. Support for new claim 12 can be found, *inter alia*, in original claim 1. Therefore, claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. Claims 8-11 have been withdrawn from consideration and claims 1 and 4-6 have been amended. The amendment to claim 1 is explained in detail below. Claim 4 has been amended to remove the phrase "which can be thermally adhered to the polyurethane sheet layer or the polyamide sheet layer;" claim 5 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the element "transparent type polyamide;" and claim 6 has been amended to re-phrase "either side of the surface" to "one of the surfaces."

In the Office Action, the abstract was objected because it contained more than 150 words. The specification was also objected to under 37 CFR 1.71 for containing allegedly conflicting information regarding the laminate structure. Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for allegedly lacking enablement and being indefinite.

The Abstract

The Abstract has been amended to contain less than 150 words and therefore Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Objection to the Specification

According to the Examiner, paragraph 34 and 54 contain conflicting information because paragraph 34 describes that a protective sheet is applied to both sides of a polarizer sheet and paragraph 54 describes a polyurethane sheet or a polyamide sheet connected to a protective sheet. Although Applicants submit that these paragraphs do not contain conflicting information as they describe the relationship of different parts of the laminate structure, Applicants have amended the specification to describe that the polarizer sheet is held between two protective sheets and that one of the two protective sheets is connected to a polyurethane sheet or a polyamide sheet. Applicants submit that this amendment to the specification does not constitute new matter as it is fully supported, *inter alia*, by paragraph 8 of the specification.

PATENT
ART UNIT 3731
10/026,295
12301/2

Rejection of the Claims

According to the Examiner, a clear description of the structural relationship of the elements of the laminate structure are not provided in the specification thereby rendering the claims indefinite and non-enabled. With respect to the lack of enablement rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that the newly added Figures 1 and 2 and the accompanying description of the figures in the specification clearly describe the structural relationship of the elements of the laminate structure and therefore Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection. Applicants submit that the submission of these drawings and the accompanying description in the specification does not constitute new matter as they are fully supported, *inter alia*, by paragraph 8 of the specification.

With respect to the indefiniteness argument, Applicants have amended claim 1 to more clearly describe the structural relationships of the different components of the laminated structure and therefore request withdrawal of this rejection. Applicants submit that support for this claim amendment can be found, *inter alia*, in paragraph 8 of the specification.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections and objections to the present application have been overcome.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required fees or to credit any overpayment associated with the filing of this response to Kenyon & Kenyon's Deposit Account No. 11-0600.


Dated: _____

May 3 2004

1500 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 220-4200
Fax: (202) 220-4201

491362v1

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON


By: _____
Zeba Ali
(Reg. No. 51,392)